

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

**CARL L. PARKER, a/k/a "Boogie,"
ROOSEVELT TURNER, a/k/a "Rope,"
ANTHONY WATTS, a/k/a "D-Mac,"
TRAVIS NORMAN,
KAREEM J. HAMILTON,
KUNTA KINTA GOREE,
TIMOTHY WEDDLE, a/k/a "Hightop,"
JESSIE DUNCAN, and
ANTHONY WOMACK, a/k/a "Bigman,"
"Bigs,"**

Defendants.

No. 05-CR-30015-DRH

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

HERNDON, District Judge:

Before the Court are motions to continue submitted by Defendant Travis Norman (Docs. 124, 129) and Defendant Kareem Hamilton (Doc. 126). The Court being fully advised in the premises finds the trial should be postponed since (1) the Government and some Defendants are in plea negotiations; (2) extensive discovery must still be conducted; and (3) the Parties intend to raise numerous issues that must be resolved. (Docs. 126, 129.) Also, the Court finds that pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A)** the ends of justice served by the granting

of such continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the Defendants in a speedy trial. Furthermore, the Court finds pursuant to **18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)** that this “case is so . . . complex, due to the number of defendants [and] the nature of the prosecution . . . that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or for the trial itself within the time limits established by” the Speedy Trial Act. Therefore, the Court **GRANTS** the pending motions to continue. (Docs. 124, 126, 129.) The Court **CONTINUES** the jury trial scheduled for Monday, June 13, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. to Tuesday, November 1, 2005, at 9:00 a.m. The time from the date the Defendants’ motion to continue was filed, May 23, 2005,¹ until the date to which the trial is rescheduled, November 1, 2005, is excludable time for the purposes of speedy trial.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 2nd day of June, 2005.

/s/ David RHerndon
United States District Judge

¹ The Court references the date of the motion to continue adopted by the Government and all Defendants who have appeared. (Doc. 129.) It is irrelevant that some motions to continue were filed earlier since this case is already in an exclusion period for purposes of Speedy Trial. (See Doc. 104)(excluding the period from early April 2005 until June 7, 2005.)